



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace

VOL. 84

MAY, 1922

No. 5

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

(1815-1828)

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate Subscription Price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, twenty cents each.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

THIS SOCIETY

IN OUR LAST NUMBER we were forced to remind our readers that if the American Peace Society was to get the \$15,000 under the terms of the offer of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, it would be necessary for the friends of the American Peace Society to come forward with approximately \$5,000 before June 30, 1922. We are able now to report that the amount remaining to be raised is \$2,100.

OUR PAMPHLET, "THE FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787," has been called for by some 20,000 persons. Only a lack of funds keeps us from supplying a potential demand running into the hundreds of thousands. Every dollar subscribed for this purpose will be doubled by the terms of the Carnegie Endowment's offer.

THE NINETY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE American Peace Society will be held at the Society's headquarters Friday, May 26, at 10 a. m.

The annual dinner of the American Peace Society will be held at Rauscher's, Washington, D. C., in the evening at 7.30 o'clock.

Members of the American Peace Society wishing to attend this dinner should notify this office on or before the 22d of May. The dinner will cost approximately five dollars a plate.

THE CONFERENCE AT GENOA

THE FACTS we get of the Genoa Conference are far from encouraging. The center of the picture is Russia. France and Belgium have financial interests in Russia, and on a large scale. Other nations have similar interests in Russia; but in 1920 the French credit in Russia amounted to over thirteen billion francs, of which about ten billions were loaned by private citizens. In France there is no faith that the Soviet Government intends to respect these obligations. The situation existing between Belgium and Russia is relatively as serious. Naturally both France and Belgium are concerned that neither they nor their citizens shall lose their property in Russia. They are standing together in their insistence upon their rights. It had been proposed at Genoa that Soviet Russia should return or restore the private property of the French, Belgians, and other foreigners or failing that, compensate all foreign interests for loss or damage caused by confiscation or sequestration in Russia; but that, in case of disagreement as to the amount of compensation, the former owner can submit the matter in dispute to a mixed arbitration tribunal. If the tribunal decides that the compensation offered by the Soviet is just, the plaintiff must accept the reward; but if not, he must be satisfied to receive from the Soviet Government "the right to enjoy his property under conditions at least as favorable for him in everything concerning its use and its free disposition as existed when in previous possession." The Belgian complaint is that such an arrangement underestimates the importance of restitution and over-emphasizes compensation. It would mean simply that Belgians would be permitted to lease property which in fact belongs to them. This proposed adjustment is founded in the claim of the Russians that any other arrangement would mean the overthrow of the communist principle of State ownership. While French interests in the petroleum fields do not equal those of certain other States, the French-owned properties in Russia, particularly in the industrial region of Donetz, are very large. Belgium's property rights in Russia amount to three billion francs, gold. Both Belgium and France take the position that they are standing simply for the rights of property, communism or no communism.

In the meantime opinion in certain quarters is, as is the fashion, quite hostile to France. This is illustrated by James Henry Thomas' warning to France, speaking at a labor demonstration at Derby, England, May 9,

when he declared that, with the possibility of war almost as threatening today as in August, 1914, "if France is determined to follow a warlike policy she must proceed by herself, for the people of Great Britain are sick of war and are not going to be parties to it."

The Genoa Conference was advertised as an attempt to come to terms with Russia, to bring Germany back into the European fold, and to set up a "Four-power Pact" for the nations of Europe. None of these things has been accomplished or seems capable of accomplishment. Russia's demand for recognition and a government loan, the French demands, the Belgian demands, the German-Russian Treaty, the miasmatic aftermaths of the Treaty of Versailles, are apparently still too much for European brains and character.

The whole difficulty revolves around Russia. The whole difficulty in Russia revolves around property. The whole difficulty with property consists in the fact that Russia has abolished private property, including the private and public property of non-Russians. Both France and Belgium are opposed to any general European peace treaty until Russia recognizes the sanctity of their property. That is sanity.

Under the circumstances, the talk of a non-aggression compact is futile. Why hope to reach an understanding with Russia? Why try to settle problems relating to frontiers? The Russian oil fields, the Russo-German Treaty, the plans for an international consortium for the exploitation of Russia—these are all nuts difficult to crack. Until Russia is reformed, they cannot be cracked.

Lloyd-George, fighting for his political life, is, it appears, destined to fail in his attempt to play the rôle of Charles Evans Hughes in the conference. He is not up to the job, mentally or morally. Advices from abroad lead us to believe that he has been inexcusably misled, or that he is still a party to the familiar European game of catch-as-catch-can. Indirections, kaleidoscopic policies, will fail, as undoubtedly they ought. Temporizing with the Soviet régime, to the undoing of the conference and to the serious injury of the world, is not the way to a stabilized Europe. It is not the business of self-respecting nations to flirt with or to make love to the group of self-appointed destroyers of Russia. The streak of flabby insincerity in the basic plans for the conference has been apparent from the outset. No one at Genoa seems able to lead, and leadership is indispensable at Genoa. A correspondent writes to us out of Europe as follows:

"If there is any one man who is more responsible than any other for European retardation and the miserable conditions following the Armistice, that man is Lloyd-George. Poincaré is absolutely right. And, if there is

to be serious trouble later, it will again be France who uses her army to protect the world, other parts of which have to bicker and delay and hitch and back and fill.

"America came in when she saw herself seriously threatened, slipped out without much injury, has now the world's wealth, and thinks she is fairly secure. She is not. The Pacific question on one coast is not disposed of with any real guarantee of permanence. Led by Lloyd-George, various forces in Europe are doing their best to open the gates to Bolshevism, and if that flood once gets really loose, there isn't a finer forcing garden anywhere in the world for it than America. It is not 'Russia' at Genoa; it is 'Bolsheviks'; and that fact should not be forgotten. Those waves can readily wash across the Atlantic.

"Remember German disaffection in America during the war; there was quite a bit of it. Remember present American industrial difficulties and unemployment. There is, indeed, a substantial area of soil quite ready for the destructive policy loved by the Bolsheviks."

Our own view is that the United States need fear nothing from the Communists, but the references to the British Prime Minister in this letter are interesting.

Mr. Lloyd-George seems to think that a loan to the Soviet Government may be desirable; but he hides behind the statement that the thing is quite impossible, not because he thinks such a thing undesirable, but "because the parliaments of the various countries able to make such a loan would not approve it." That is not brave language. It is cowardly talk. Neither does it serve any purpose to tell the Bolsheviks at Genoa that if they will "restore the confidence of the world, Russia can get all the money she needs." That, too, is just shifty business. There can be no "confidence" in an irresponsible Russia.

We cannot go forward by going backward. Even Lloyd-George cannot play on both sides of the fence at one and the same time. When he declares in the Cannes resolution that Russia has a right to have any property régime the Russians like, he is on one side of the fence; when he says in the same instrument that if Russia is to get outside help she must restore or compensate for the investments private capital has made in that land, he is playing on the other side of the fence; for Russia cannot do both of these things. The Bolsheviks cannot both recognize and refuse to recognize the private ownership of property, even if they agree to do so, as Lloyd-George proposes.

The stage at Genoa was arranged for the purpose of opening up a Soviet-ruined Russia to the end that a hungry Europe might get something to eat. The play is a failure. Whiffing policies have turned Genoa into a publicity bureau for the most discredited group of political bunglers of modern times, with the result that these shysters are arrogantly demanding not only recognition, but enormous loans from the nations of Europe.

It seems to us that only France and Belgium in this situation are saving Europe.

When the Russian people get hold of their own government, then, and not until then, can the results of the tragic mismanagement of economic and political affairs in Russia be overcome. Freedom of property must be restored in Russia. It may not come at once, but come it will. Production and transportation will wait until that is accomplished. When we say that salvation must come from within Russia, that is precisely what we mean. Without production, there can be no trade. Without trade, there can be no reliability. Without reliability, there can be no political recognition.

The United States Government did well to stay away from Genoa, for Genoa has not been able to re-establish, not even to visualize, the principles of life, the sacredness of contract, the guarantees of property, the rights of free labor, real basic things upon which a workable civilization must rest.

But if the Genoa Conference should fail in every one of the projects proposed at the outset, it will prove to have been of service. The calling of the conference was inevitable. The work of the conference has been far more arduous than that of the Washington Conference. It marks another step toward the new Europe that is to be. The French and Belgians have dined with Germans and Russians. That is a statement more significant than it sounds. The reports of the commissions show that the statesmen of Europe are bringing to light again the basic principles upon which States can live in peace. Sound currency, balanced budgets, personal and property rights, the sanctity of contract, the equality of States under the law—these are the things which because of the Conference in Genoa have become more apparent not only to the statesmen, but to the people of Europe.

Since writing these words the situation at Genoa has darkened. The delegates have tried to save the situation by developing what is known as the "Hague Plan," under which the powers would be asked to send delegates to The Hague, June 15, to choose a commission of experts which shall have ten days to agree upon some solution of the Russian problems of credits, debts, and private property. If such a statement is approved by the respective governments, including Russia, a conference shall be called June 26, for a maximum period of three months, to reach an agreement to be ratified by the governments. The United States was invited to join the commission at The Hague; but, fortunately, our government has had the wisdom to decline. The Russian memorandum of May 11 cannot even be discussed by the United States Government. It is not the duty of the United States to interfere with the internal affairs of another nation, even Russia. But it is the privilege and it is the duty of self-respecting nations to decide the company they shall keep.

A LEGITIMATE SERVICE TO THE WOUNDED SOLDIERS

THE SANEST utterance we have read relating to our service to the wounded soldiers has come to us in Bulletin Number 1 of the Soldiers' Institute, District 4. We read: "The best bonus that the government or the American people can give to the wounded soldiers is re-education suited to their special needs." That sentence points the way. Only in the rarest instance ought physical disability to mean social dependency. In the majority of cases the wounded men will wish to play their part as self-sustaining units. If because of educational limitations or lack of vision any are unable to hold their own, education must supply the need. To give them such an education would be a "bonus" worthy of support. To paraphrase one of Benjamin Franklin's sage remarks, if we empty our pocketbooks into their heads, nobody can take our gifts away from these deserving ones. Education, vocational or otherwise, is better than any other "handout," be it a bonus or a pension. As far as possible, we must avoid pauperizing these our broken men.

The Soldiers' Institute—a living, moving, breathing service—ought to succeed. None doubts the duty we owe to these sightless, armless, legless, and oftentimes homeless men, to whom we promised so much when we urged them to offer their all to the cause which we thought demanded it. True, the new Veterans' Bureau established under the Sweet bill out of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, the Federal Board of Vocational Education, and the Bureaus of Public Health are administering to war veterans. We are spending \$108,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation of our ex-soldiers. But there are many thousands not eligible for vocational training under the rules of this bureau. We are told that in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia there are over 36,000 of such men, over 172,000 in our nation at large. Manifestly, here is a special group requiring special attention.

Then, too, there are not a few among this number ambitious to succeed in the fine arts, for which their talents and even their disabilities especially fit them. Many of them are capable of becoming musicians or sculptors or painters or draftsmen, including cartoonists. Some of these men could be led to win their way in journalism, short-story writing, advertisement writing, and the like. Other promising fields are agriculture, horticulture, stock-raising, engineering, plus the arts.

Undoubtedly art is as essential to the lives of these men as it is to the lives of the rest of us. From the Bulletin of the Soldiers' Institute we quote:

"Industry without art is sordid, and takes the joy out of life.